

REMARKS

I. The 35 U.S.C. §103 Rejections

Claims 1-36 were rejected under 35 U.S.C. §103(a) as being unpatentable over U.S. Patent No. 6,535,911 B1 issued to Miller et al. ("MILLER"). Applicant respectfully traverses the rejections.

A. Claim 1

It is axiomatic that the combination of the cited references in a §103 rejection must disclose every element in the rejected claim. MPEP 2143.03. Claim 1 recites a method of intelligently caching applications and data on a gateway, comprising the steps of:

"calculating a cache benefit index for a set of files, said cache benefit index indicating a total benefit for caching said set of files;

determining whether to cache said set of files on a local file system based on said cache benefit index;

caching said set of files on said local file system; and

updating a set of tables in a gateway database based on said caching."

As demonstrated below, Applicant respectfully submits that MILLER fails to disclose or suggest multiple steps recited in claim 1.

1. Overview of MILLER

MILLER discloses a method for “maintaining an updated version of information originated from an original distribution media” on a client computer via a remote server. MILLER, col. 1, lines 51-54. Specifically, when a client computer wishes to update a version of information, the client computer sends a request which includes “a synchronization file” to a remote server. MILLER, col. 1, lines 60-63. Based on the synchronization file, the remote server determines which files should be updated at the client computer and downloads the appropriate files to the client computer. MILLER, col. 2, lines 41-53. MILLER does not disclose or suggest any method for intelligently caching data on a gateway.

In contrast, claim 1 recites a method of intelligently caching applications and data on a gateway.

2. MILLER Fails to Disclose or Suggest the Step of Calculating a Cache Benefit Index for a Set of Files

Claim 1 recites calculating a cache benefit index that indicates a total benefit of caching a set of files. The Examiner cites col. 6, lines 35-41 as allegedly disclosing this step. The cited portion in MILLER discloses an entry or record within a synchronization file.

Entry comprises three fields: file identifier (e.g., identifying the name and path of a file in storage); CRC value (e.g., the cyclic redundancy check value of the identified file); and file size (e.g., number of bytes or blocks) of identified file of the current entry.

MILLER, col. 6, lines 35-41 (emphasis added).

The contents of the synchronization file help the remote server determine which files to download to the client computer. MILLER, col. 6, lines 31-33. Neither the cited

portion nor anywhere else in MILLER discloses the step of calculating a cache benefit index that indicates the benefit of caching a file as recited in claim 1.

3. MILLER Fails to Disclose or Suggest the Step of Determining Whether to Cache a Set of Files ... Based on Said Cache Benefit Index

Claim 1 also recites the step of determining whether to cache a set of files based on the cache benefit index.

MILLER does not disclose or suggest any method for calculating a cache benefit index. Therefore, logically, MILLER cannot disclose determining whether to cache a file based on the calculated cache benefit index. The portion of MILLER cited by the Examiner for allegedly disclosing this step discloses using the synchronization file to determine which files to download to a client computer. In addition, the synchronization file disclosed in MILLER does NOT contain any cache benefit index. MILLER, col. 6, lines 35-41.

Applicant has reviewed MILLER in detail but could not find any disclosure or suggestion for the step of determining whether to cache a set of files based on the cache benefit index. If the Examiner believes otherwise, Applicant requests the Examiner to cite the specific portion of MILLER in the next action.

Based on the foregoing, MILLER fails to disclose or suggest multiple steps recited in claim 1 and claim 1 should be in condition for allowance

B. Claims 2-18

Claims 2-18 are dependent upon claim 1 and therefore should also be in condition for allowance.

C. Claim 19

Independent claim 19 recites a computer program product comprising logic code that, when executed, perform the steps as recited in claim 1. Based on Applicant's foregoing arguments with respect to claim 1, Applicant believes that claim 19 is also not unpatentable over MILLER and should be in condition for allowance.

D. Claims 20-36

Claims 20-36 are dependent upon claim 19 and therefore should also be in condition for allowance.

II. Conclusion

In view of the foregoing, it is respectfully submitted that the application is now in condition for allowance. Should the Examiner believe that a telephone interview would help advance the prosecution of this case, the Examiner is requested to contact the undersigned attorney.

Respectfully submitted,

By:


Roxana H. Yang
Registration No. 46,788

Law Office of Roxana H. Yang
P.O. Box 3986
Los Altos, CA 94024
(408)749-8098